



Department of Education
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

Getting Results Continuous Improvement Plan 2011-2012

Principal Name:	Ms. Sharon Williams
School Name:	AGORA CYBER CS
District Name:	AGORA CYBER CS
School Number:	7858
AYP Status:	Corrective Action II (first year)

School Improvement Team Members

Name	Role/Position
Michelle Goodman	Federal Programs Coordinator
Sharon Williams	Principal/CAO - Head of School
Kim Gallis	Elementary Teacher
Nicole Johnson	Master Teacher
Judy Deemer	Special Education Manager
Amy Rupp	Middle School Director
Christina Rivera	State Data and Reporting Coordinator
Jane Swan	High School Director
Heather Silberman	Special Education Teacher
April Nix	Elementary Director

Review Data

This table contains the 2010 AYP data for the school. This data helps schools identify what must be addressed in the Action Sequences. This school **must** address any areas where they failed to meet the AYP targets or met the AYP targets by one of Pennsylvania's Special Provisions in the areas of Academic Performance, Participation, and Attendance/Graduation.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE	Did Not Make AYP	Made AYP By Special Provision	Made AYP
Reading	IEP: 25.2%	Students Overall: 55.4% (GM) White: 60.7% (CI) Black: 40.8% (GM) Hispanic: 38.8% (GM) Multi-racial: 56.9% (CI) Econ Dis: 46.8% (GM)	
Math	Black: 30.4% Hispanic: 36.5% IEP: 28.4% Econ Dis: 37.7%	Students Overall: 47% (GM) White: 52.6% (GM) Multi-racial: 41.4% (GM)	

Special Provisions Legend

CI	Group met target using Confidence Interval	SH	Group met target using Safe Harbor
SHC	Group met target using Safe Harbor with Confidence Interval	GM	Group met target using Growth Model
A	Group met target using an Appeal		

OTHER TARGET AREAS	YES/NO
Test Participation	Target Met
Attendance/Graduation	Graduation Percentage: 68.57%

Analyze Effectiveness of 2009-10 Action Sequences

The following information documents the school's evaluation of the effectiveness of 2009-2010 Action Sequences.

2009-10 Reading Action Sequence

Step 1: Research-based strategies/best practices for READING:

Students will take part in the Scantron Performance series, a baseline reading assessment, within the first month of enrollment and attend instruction on standard aligned anchors. Weekly, students will take an Achievement series assessment on those anchors. If a passing grade of 80% is attained, the student is considered proficient on that anchor. Students who score below 80% will be provided targeted remediation. The same cycle continues the next week on new anchors.

Title I Schoolwide (Reading Specialists) -RtII -Whole School Remediation -Compass Learning Odyssey -Small Group Sessions

and One on One Support -Paraeducators to increase engagement - Clarify roles of Parent/Learning coach

Step 2: Level of Implementation:

- Reading strategies were **fully** implemented
- Reading strategies were **partially** implemented
- Reading strategies were **not** implemented

Step 3: Describe the evidence gathered to show the READING strategies were implemented:

We have implemented our planned strategies of baseline assessments and schoolwide supports. We monitor Reading participation and proficiency through the Scantron Performance assessments. We average over 90% participation of the baseline evaluation. Our Reading Specialists maintain metrics of student attendance in sessions and progress for the week. We maintain a record of students referred to the RtII Tier Review. On a weekly basis we review student participation in Compass Learning Odyssey and interventions provided by the teacher, as well as metrics to measure the effectiveness of interventions provided by the Paraeducators. During the enrollment process and in orientation sessions, we inform guardians and Learning Coaches of their roles and responsibilities within our educational model. Home visits also provide the parent the opportunity to discuss any concerns about our model and supports that may be beneficial to their child. In response to the 2009-2010 PSSA test scores the strategy of weekly assessments was revised. The plan for weekly reading assessments in Middle School and Elementary was adjusted to monthly assessments with weekly strategies. In lieu of the weekly formal Scantron Assessments, there have been an increased expectation of remediation. Our High School implemented weekly reading assessments. We monitor student participation and proficiency of these assessments.

Step 4: Use student level data to describe whether there has been a positive impact on the READING achievement of your students:

Aimsweb screenings and high school proficiency levels show a positive impact on Reading achievement. At the High School the passing rate reflects 60% proficiency. In addition to the Scantron Performance Assessment we screened students in grades 2-8 with Aimsweb. The Aimsweb Fall and Winter screening results demonstrate an increase from Intensive to Benchmark for grades 2-8. We decreased our percentage of students in Intensive from 30% to 21% while increasing those at Benchmark from 53% to 64%. Reading achievement is an area for continued improvement. We have started to implement the Essential Elements of Instruction and continue to implement CoTeaching to ensure that effective strategies are being utilized. We monitor implementation through teacher observations and have increased discussion and review of the teacher metrics. We will continue ongoing professional development of proven best strategies.

2009-10 Math Action Sequence

Step 1: Research-based strategies/best practices for MATH:

Students will take part in the Scantron Performance series, a baseline math assessment, within the first month of enrollment and attend instruction on standard aligned anchors. Weekly, students will take an Achievement series assessment on those anchors. If a passing grade of 80% is attained, the student is considered proficient on that anchor. Students who score below 80% will be provided targeted remediation. The same cycle continues the next week on new anchors.

Title I Schoolwide (Math Specialists) -RtII -Whole School Remediation -Compass Learning Odyssey -Small Group Sessions and One on One Support - Paraeducators to increase engagement - Clarify roles of Parent/Learning coach

Step 2: Level of Implementation:

- Math strategies were **fully** implemented
- Math strategies were **partially** implemented
- Math strategies were **not** implemented

Step 3: Describe the evidence gathered to show the MATH strategies were implemented:

We implemented each strategy and are continuing to improve execution. We monitor participation and proficiency in Math through the Scantron Performance assessments and weekly Scantron Achievement sessions. We average over 95% participation of the baseline evaluation. Our Math Specialists maintain metrics of student attendance in sessions and progress for the week. As with Reading, we maintain a record of students referred to the RtII Tier Review. On a weekly basis we review student participation and lessons completed in Compass Learning Odyssey and interventions provided by the teacher, as well as metrics to measure the effectiveness of interventions provided by the Paraeducators. During the enrollment process and in orientation sessions, we inform guardians and Learning Coaches of their roles and responsibilities within our educational model. Home visits also provide the parent the opportunity to discuss any concerns about our model and supports that may be beneficial to their child.

Step 4: Use student level data to describe whether there has been a positive impact on the MATH achievement of your students: During the school year we implemented the strategies, but review of the data shows inconsistency in Math achievement. Review of the weekly achievement assessments show grade level improvements in grades 3 and 4 by 20%. Our data shows an improvement in both proficiency and participation rates at the end of the week at all grade levels. Participation increases 40% for all grades after Teachers and Paraeducators reach out to students who did not participate at the start of the week. In grades 3 through 5 we see an increase of about 5% weekly in performance from the beginning of the week to the end of the week. The students who test average around 89% proficiency at the beginning of the week and around 95% proficiency by the end of the week. In grades 6 and 7 we see a gains from 50% to 70% proficiency. We see an increase in eighth grade as well from 70% to 76%. These gains are seen after students are identified for small class lessons with the teacher or Math Specialist. We still have strong concerns that our 6th and 7th graders in not meeting achievement targets. At the Middle School and High School we are continuing to identify ways to better serve our struggling students. Continued professional development will include strategies of effective instruction.

2009-10 Other Action Sequence

Step 1: Research-based strategies/best practices for Other:

Agora met Attendance and Graduation Targets.

Step 2: Level of Implementation:

- Other strategies were **fully** implemented
- Other strategies were **partially** implemented
- Other strategies were **not** implemented

Step 3: Describe the evidence gathered to show the Other strategies were implemented:

2008-2009 was the first graduating class not to meet the target of 85%. A plan was not required for the 2009-2010 SIP but will be included for 2010-2011.

Step 4: Use student level data to describe whether there has been a positive impact on the MATH achievement of your students: Our previous School Improvement Plans did not include a strategy for graduation.

Reading Data

The following table includes pre-populated AYP data, PSSA, achievement data and PVAAS growth data at the whole school, grade, and subgroup levels.

Data may include 2 year/3 year averaging and/or exited students

	DATA INQUIRY	DATA STATEMENT
Whole School		
R1	At least 63% of the "All Student Group" is advanced or proficient in READING. <i>Data source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The "All Student Group" was below the target by 7.6%.
R2	The "All Student Group" made AYP in READING with the help of a special provision. <i>Data source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The "All Student Group" met performance targets with the help of the GM special provision.
R3	The school made one year's growth in READING. <i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com) Grades 4-8 – School Value Added Report (2010 Mean NCE Gain over Grades relative to Growth Standard) Grade11 – School Value Added Report (2010 School Effect)</i>	Grades 4-8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The "All Student Group" made one year's growth. Grade 11: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The "All Student Group" was significantly below the progress of the average school in the state.
R4	The school-wide trend for the "All Student Group" during the past 3 years reflects an increase each year in the percent of proficient or advanced students in READING. <i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Reading Results</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 60.3% to 58.8%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 58.8% to 55.4%.
R5	The "All Student Group" met the AYP target for Participation in READING. <i>Data Source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The "All Student Group" met the 95% participation target.
Grade Level		
R6	Every grade in the school met or exceeded the NCLB READING target of 63% proficient or advanced. <i>Data Source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Reading Results</i>	Not all grades met or exceeded the target. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade 3: 60.3%. Grade 4: 52.6%. Grade 5: 42.3%. Grade 6: 50%. Grade 7: 61.6%. Grade 8: 63.5%. Grade 11: 54.9%.
R7	Every grade in the school made one year's growth in READING. <i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com) Grades 4-8 – School Value Added Report (2010 Mean NCE Gain for each grade level) Grade11 – School Value Added Report (2010 School Effect)</i>	Grades 4-8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade(s) 6, 7 made one year's growth. Grade(s) 4, 5, 8 did not make one year's growth. Grade 11: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade 11 was significantly below the progress of the average school in the state.
R8	Every grade that did NOT meet the proficiency target made one year's growth in READING. <i>Data Source: (pssa.emetric.net) and (pvaas.sas.com) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Reading Results & PVAAS School Value Added Reports</i>	Grades 4-8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade(s) 6, 7 did NOT meet the 63% target, but made one year's growth. Grade(s) 4, 5 did NOT meet the 63% target AND did NOT make one year's growth. Grade 11: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade 11 did NOT meet the 63% target and Grade 11 was significantly below the progress of the average school in the state.
	Every predicted performance level group (below basic, basic, proficient, advanced) in each grade made one	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Grade 4, these predicted proficiency groups made one year's growth: Below Basic. However, these predicted proficiency groups did NOT make one year's growth: Basic, Proficient, Advanced. In Grade 5, no predicted proficiency groups made one year's growth. In Grade 6, these predicted proficiency groups made one year's growth: Advanced. However, these predicted proficiency groups did NOT make one

<p>R9</p>	<p>year's growth in READING.</p> <p><i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com) PVAAS School Performance Diagnostic Summary Report (2010 Gain)</i></p>	<p>year's growth: Below Basic, Basic, Proficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Grade 7, all predicted proficiency groups made one year's growth. • In Grade 8, these predicted proficiency groups made one year's growth: Below Basic, Basic. However, these predicted proficiency groups did NOT make one year's growth: Proficient, Advanced. • In Grade 11, these predicted proficiency groups made a year's growth: Below Basic. However, these predicted proficiency groups did NOT make one year's growth: Basic, Proficient, Advanced.
<p>R10</p>	<p>Each tested grade has at least 72% (AYP target for SY 10-11) of the students in the 70% -100% probability range of reaching proficiency in READING at the next tested grade.</p> <p><i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com) PVAAS School (Single Grade) Projection Summary Report</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the tested grades in the school have at least 72% of the students in the 70%-100% probability range of reaching proficiency.
<p>R11</p>	<p>Every grade level trend for the past 3 years reflects an increase each year in the percent of proficient or advanced students in READING.</p> <p><i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Reading Results</i></p>	<p>Not all grades show a positive three year trend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Grade 3, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 68.9% to 64.8%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 64.8% to 60.3%. • In Grade 4, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 68.5% to 59.1%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 59.1% to 52.6%. • In Grade 5, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 50.8% to 54.2%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 54.2% to 42.3%. • In Grade 6, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 59.7% to 52.1%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 52.1% to 50%. • In Grade 7, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 53.8% to 61.7%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 61.7% to 61.6%. • In Grade 8, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 65.7% to 63.1%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 63.1% to 63.5%. • In Grade 11, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 53.9% to 53.8%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 53.8% to 54.9%.
<p>Subgroup Level</p>		
<p>R12</p>	<p>Every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) met or exceeded the NCLB READING target of 63% proficient or advanced.</p> <p><i>Data Source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i></p>	<p>No relevant subgroup met the 63% target.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25.2% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced. • 46.8% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced. • 40.8% of the Black subgroup was proficient or advanced. • 38.8% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced. • 60.7% of the White subgroup was proficient or advanced. • 56.9% of the Multiracial subgroup was proficient or advanced.
<p>R13</p>	<p>Every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) met AYP in READING with the help of a special provision.</p> <p><i>Data source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i></p>	<p>The following relevant subgroups made AYP in Reading with the help of a special provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ED subgroup with GM provision. • Black subgroup with GM provision. • Latino subgroup with GM provision. • White subgroup with CI provision. • Multiracial subgroup with CI provision.
	<p>Each relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) closed the gap in proficiency between itself and the overall student group in READING.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proficiency gap has increased between every

R14	<p><i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net)</i> <i>Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Reading Results</i></p>	<p>relevant subgroup and the "All Student Group".</p>
R15	<p>The trend for the past 3 years for every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) reflects an increase each year in the percent of proficient or advanced students in READING.</p> <p><i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net)</i> <i>Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Reading Results</i></p>	<p>Not all relevant subgroups show a positive three year trend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage for the IEP subgroup went from 24% to 28.6%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 28.6% to 25.2%. • In SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage for the ED subgroup went from 51.7% to 48.9%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 48.9% to 46.8%. • In SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage for the Black subgroup went from 45% to 45.8%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 45.8% to 40.8%. • In SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage for the Latino subgroup went from 44.3% to 38.8%. • In SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage for the White subgroup went from 65.3% to 62.5%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 62.5% to 60.7%.
R16	<p>Every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) met the AYP target for Participation in READING.</p> <p><i>Data Source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every relevant subgroup met the 95% participation target.

Locally Relevant Reading Data

The school has included the following data which provides additional information about student achievement in the area of reading:

Reading Assessment	Reading Data
<p>Scantron Assessment-utilized to assess student's proficiency after direct instruction on the anchor. Administered weekly.</p>	<p>Review of students who tested from Sept to February: Of our 3rd, 4th and 11th graders who took the test more than 64% passed. The data indicates that our 11th grade students are not proficient in the following eligible content: Main Idea, Summarization, Theme, Tone, Style and Mood. Of our 7th and 8th graders who took the assessment approximately half passed as didn't. For our 5th and 6th intense remediation is required. *Passed 3rd Grade 64% 4th Grade 68% 5th Grade 11% 6th Grade 14% 7th Grade 50% 8th Grade 46% 11th Grade 66% Grand Total 45% *Didn't Pass 3rd Grade 36% 4th Grade 32% 5th Grade 89% 6th Grade 86% 7th Grade 50% 8th Grade 54% 11th Grade 34% Grand Total 55%</p>
<p>Scantron Performance-baseline assessment. Administered within 2 weeks of enrollment and again in the spring.</p>	<p>As of January 2011 96% of students who were currently enrolled had participated in the Scantron Performance Assessment in Reading. We see that about about 30% of our students are On Target. *At Risk Grade 3 6% Grade 4 8% Grade 5 11% Grade 6 12% Grade 7 12% Grade 8 11% Grade 9 13% Grade 10 8% Grade 11 8% Grade 12 5% *On Target Grade 3 26% Grade 4 29% Grade 5 28% Grade 6 36% Grade 7 39% Grade 8 39% Grade 9 35% Grade 10 43% Grade 11 46% Grade 12 37% *Advanced Grade 3 11% Grade 4 10% Grade 5 10% Grade 6 4% Grade 7 6% Grade 8 4% Grade 9 4% Grade 10 3% Grade 11 5% Grade 12 7%</p>
<p>Aimsweb Fall and Winter Assessments</p>	<p>Both Fall and Winter Assessments place the greater number of students at Benchmark. We see growth overall from Fall to Winter in Benchmark students. We also see a decrease overall from Fall to Winter in Intensive students. We see growth in all areas except 8th grade. Fall: *Benchmark 2nd Grade 46% 3rd Grade 46% 4th Grade 56% 5th Grade 55% 6th Grade 66% 7th Grade 50% 8th Grade 47% Grand Total 54% *Strategic 2nd Grade 9% 3rd Grade 20% 4th Grade 18% 5th Grade 19% 6th Grade 20% 7th Grade 13% 8th Grade 0% Grand Total 17% *Intensive 2nd Grade 45% 3rd Grade 35% 4th Grade 26% 5th Grade 26% 6th Grade 15% 7th Grade 38% 8th Grade 53% Grand Total 30% Winter:</p>

*Benchmark 1st Grade 66% 2nd Grade 59% 3rd Grade 58%
 4th Grade 61% 5th Grade 64% 6th Grade 73% 7th Grade
 61% 8th Grade 44% Grand Total 63% *Strategic 1st Grade
 19% 2nd Grade 9% 3rd Grade 16% 4th Grade 18% 5th
 Grade 20% 6th Grade 15% 7th Grade 7% 8th Grade 4%
 Grand Total 15% *Intensive 1st Grade 15% 2nd Grade 32%
 3rd Grade 25% 4th Grade 21% 5th Grade 16% 6th Grade
 12% 7th Grade 32% 8th Grade 53% Grand Total 21%

Synthesize Reading Data

These are the strengths and concerns that have been identified from the analysis of reading achievement and growth data.

#	AREAS OF STRENGTH
1	The "All Student Group" met the 95% participation target. Every relevant subgroup met the 95% participation target. R5 and R16
2	The "All Student Group" met performance targets with the help of the GM special provision. R2
3	The "All Student Group" made one year's growth and Grades 6 and 7 made one year's growth. R3 and R7

#	AREAS OF CONCERN
1	Not all grades met or exceeded the target, the "All Student Group" was below 7.6% target •Grade 3: 60.3%. •Grade 4: 52.6%. •Grade 5: 42.3%. •Grade 6: 50%. •Grade 7: 61.6%. •Grade 8: 63.5%. •Grade 11: 54.9%. R1, R6, and R10
2	For all students we are not seeing sustained increased growth. The "All Student Group" was significantly below the progress of the average school in the state. From SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 60.3% to 58.8%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 58.8% to 55.4%. R3, R4, R11
3	No relevant subgroup met the 63% target Subgroup Proficient or Advanced • IEP: 25.2% •Economically Disadvantaged: 46.8%. • Black: 40.8%. •Latino: 38.8% •White: 60.7% •Multiracial: 56.9% R12

Math Data

The following table includes pre-populated AYP data, PSSA achievement data and PVAAS growth data at the whole school, grade, and subgroup levels.

	DATA INQUIRY	DATA STATEMENT
Whole School		
M1	At least 56% of the "All Student Group" is advanced or proficient in MATH. <i>Data source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	•The "All Student Group" was below the target by 9%.
M2	The "All Student Group" made AYP in MATH with the help of a special provision. <i>Data source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	•The "All Student Group" met performance targets with the help of the GM special provision.
M3	The school made one year's growth in MATH. <i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com)</i> <i>Grades 4-8 – School Value Added Report (2010 Mean NCE Gain over Grades relative to Growth Standard)</i> <i>Grade11 – School Value Added Report (2010 School Effect)</i>	Grades 4-8: •The "All Student Group" made one year's growth. Grade 11: •The "All Student Group" was significantly below the progress of the average school in the state.
M4	The school-wide trend for the "All Student Group" during the past 3 years reflects an increase each year in the percent of proficient or advanced students in MATH. <i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net)</i> <i>Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Math Results</i>	•From SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 47.2% to 46.2%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 46.2% to 47%.
M5	The "All Student Group" met the AYP target for Participation in MATH. <i>Data Source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	•The "All Student Group" met the 95% participation target.
Grade Level		
M6	Every grade in the school met or exceeded the NCLB MATH target of 56% proficient or advanced. <i>Data Source: (pssa.emetric.net)</i> <i>Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Math Results</i>	Not all grades met or exceeded the target. •Grade 3: 57.7%. •Grade 4: 61.5%. •Grade 5: 44.5%. •Grade 6: 49.6%. •Grade 7: 52.7%. •Grade 8: 38.5%. •Grade 11: 27.9%.
M7	Every grade in the school made one year's growth in MATH. <i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com)</i> <i>Grades 4-8 – School Value Added Report (2010 Mean NCE Gain for each grade level)</i> <i>Grade11 – School Value Added Report (2010 School Effect)</i>	Grades 4-8: •Grade(s) 4, 6, 7 made one year's growth. •Grade(s) 5, 8 did not make one year's growth. Grade 11: •Grade 11 was significantly below the mean predicted score.
M8	Every grade that did NOT meet the proficiency target made one year's growth in MATH. <i>Data Source: (pssa.emetric.net) and (pvaas.sas.com)</i> <i>Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Math Results & PVAAS School Value Added Reports</i>	Grades 4-8: •Grade(s) 6, 7 did NOT meet the 56% target, but made one year's growth. •Grade(s) 5, 8 did NOT meet the 56% target AND did NOT make one year's growth. Grade 11: •Grade 11 did NOT meet the 56% target and Grade 11 was significantly below the mean predicted score.
M9	Every predicted performance level group (below basic, basic, proficient, advanced) in each grade made one year's growth in MATH.	• In Grade 4, all predicted proficiency groups made one year's growth. • In Grade 5, these predicted proficiency groups made one year's growth: Below Basic. However, these predicted proficiency groups did NOT make one year's growth: Basic, Proficient, Advanced. • In Grade 6, these predicted proficiency groups made one year's growth: Basic, Proficient, Advanced. However, these predicted proficiency groups did NOT make one year's growth: Below

	<p><i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com)</i> PVAAS School Performance Diagnostic Summary Report (2010 Gain)</p>	<p>Basic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Grade 7, these predicted proficiency groups made one year's growth: Below Basic, Basic, Advanced. However, these predicted proficiency groups did NOT make one year's growth: Proficient. • In Grade 8, no predicted proficiency groups made one year's growth. • In Grade 11, no predicted proficiency groups made one year's growth.
M10	<p>Each tested grade has at least 67% (AYP target for SY 10-11) of the students in the 70% -100% probability range of reaching proficiency in MATH at the next tested grade.</p> <p><i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com)</i> PVAAS School (Single Grade) Projection Summary Report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the tested grades in the school have at least 67% of the students in the 70%-100% probability range of reaching proficiency.
M11	<p>Every grade level trend for the past 3 years reflects an increase each year in the percent of proficient or advanced students in MATH.</p> <p><i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net)</i> Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Math Results</p>	<p>Not all grades show a positive three year trend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Grade 3, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 53.3% to 60%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 60% to 57.7%. • In Grade 4, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 61.3% to 60.5%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 60.5% to 61.5%. • In Grade 5, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 44.4% to 46.5%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 46.5% to 44.5%. • In Grade 6, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 56.8% to 48.6%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 48.6% to 49.6%. • In Grade 7, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 45.3% to 48.8%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 48.8% to 52.7%. • In Grade 8, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 40.6% to 35.8%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 35.8% to 38.5%. • In Grade 11, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 27.5% to 22.2%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 22.2% to 27.9%.
Subgroup Level		
M12	<p>Every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) met or exceeded the NCLB MATH target of 56% proficient or advanced.</p> <p><i>Data Source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i></p>	<p>No relevant subgroup met the 56% target.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28.4% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced. • 37.7% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced. • 30.4% of the Black subgroup was proficient or advanced. • 36.5% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced. • 52.6% of the White subgroup was proficient or advanced. • 41.4% of the Multiracial subgroup was proficient or advanced.
M13	<p>Every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) met AYP in MATH with the help of a special provision.</p> <p><i>Data source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i></p>	<p>The following relevant subgroups made AYP in Math with the help of a special provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • White subgroup with GM provision. • Multiracial subgroup with GM provision.
M14	<p>Each relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) closed the gap in proficiency between itself and the overall student group in MATH.</p> <p><i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net)</i> Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Math Results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following relevant subgroup(s) closed the gap: Black, IEP, ED, however, the following relevant subgroup(s) did not close the gap: Latino.

<p>M15</p>	<p>The trend for the past 3 years for every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) reflects an increase each year in the percent of proficient or advanced students in MATH.</p> <p><i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Math Results</i></p>	<p>Not all relevant subgroups show a positive three year trend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage for the IEP subgroup went from 17.9% to 23.5%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 23.5% to 28.4%. • In SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage for the ED subgroup went from 35.8% to 37.5%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 37.5% to 37.7%. • In SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage for the Black subgroup went from 28.2% to 29%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 29% to 30.4%. • In SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage for the Latino subgroup went from 36.6% to 36.5%. • In SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage for the White subgroup went from 52.2% to 51%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 51% to 52.6%.
<p>M16</p>	<p>Every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) met the AYP target for Participation in MATH.</p> <p><i>Data Source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every relevant subgroup met the 95% participation target.

Locally Relevant Math Data

The school has included the following data which provides additional information about student achievement in the area of math.

<p>Math Assessment</p>	<p>Math Data</p>
<p>Scantron Performance-utilized to assess student's proficiency after direct instruction on the anchor. Administered weekly.</p>	<p>As of January 2011 97% of students participated. *At Risk Grade 3 18% Grade 4 13% Grade 5 29% Grade 6 18% Grade 7 18% Grade 8 20% Grade 9 17% Grade 10 53% Grade 11 58% Grade 12 42% Schoolwide 30% *On Target Grade 3 23% Grade 4 24% Grade 5 12% Grade 6 30% Grade 7 35% Grade 8 31% Grade 9 35% Grade 10 0% Grade 11 1% Grade 12 3% Schoolwide 19% *Advanced Grade 3 11% Grade 4 9% Grade 5 7% Grade 6 3% Grade 7 3% Grade 8 2% Grade 9 1% Grade 10 1% Grade 11 1% Grade 12 4% Schoolwide 4%</p>
<p>Scantron Assessment-baseline assessment. Administered within 2 weeks of enrollment and again in the spring.</p>	<p>80% of our 3rd and 4th grade students who took the assessment demonstrated proficiency. 50% of our 5th through 11th grade students demonstrated proficiency. *Didn't Pass 3rd Grade 12% 4th Grade 19% 5th Grade 45% 6th Grade 45% 7th Grade 54% 8th Grade 49% 11th Grade 52% Grand Total 42% *Passed 3rd Grade 88% 4th Grade 81% 5th Grade 55% 6th Grade 55% 7th Grade 46% 8th Grade 51% 11th Grade 48% Grand Total 58%</p>

Synthesize Math Data

#	AREAS OF STRENGTH
1	The "All Student Group" met performance targets with the help of the GM special provision. M2
2	Grade(s) 4, 6, 7 made one year's growth.
3	The "All Student Group" met the 95% participation target. Every relevant subgroup met the 95% participation target. M5 and M16

#	AREAS OF CONCERN
1	The "All Student Group" was below the target by 9%. •From SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 47.2% to 46.2%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 46.2% to 47%. M1 and M4
2	Not all grades met or exceeded the target. •3rd: 57.7%. •4th: 61.5%. •5th: 44.5%. •6th: 49.6%. •7th: 52.7% • Grade(s) 5, 8 did not make one year's growth. Grade 11 was significantly below the mean predicted score. M6 and M7
3	No relevant subgroup met the 56% target. Subgroup Proficient or Advanced • IEP: 28.4% •Economically Disadvantaged: 37.7%. • Black: 30.4%. •Latino: 36.5% •White: 52.6% •Multiracial: 41.4% M12

Analyze Systems

The school analyzed their standards aligned systems by using the self-assessment criteria of the Foundational Guiding Questions.

	FOUNDATIONAL GUIDING QUESTIONS	No/Yes	Supporting Evidence
1	Is there strong, observable evidence that the standards-aligned curriculum and effective instructional practices are consistently implemented across all classrooms?	No	All Agora students have access to the K12, Inc. curriculum which is aligned to PA state standards. The curriculum is housed on a learning management system & developed by cognitive scientists, noted leaders in the education field, math/reading specialists, flash designers & other subject matter experts. Online lessons are offered that are state standards based, instructed & remediated by highly qualified teachers & recorded for review by administration. 3 times a year teachers are observed and evaluated on the inclusion of the Essential Elements of Instruction in their lessons. Based on these observations, monitoring of passing rates and through the review of the weekly student metrics, we recognize there is inconsistent effective instruction. Review of the teacher metrics indicate that weekly 50% of our students are being offered interventions however review of the weekly assessments indicate that as high as 65% of students may need additional remediation to meet content proficiency.
2	Is there strong, observable evidence that school staff regularly uses standards-aligned assessments to monitor student achievement and adjust instructional practices?	No	Instruction, assessment & remediation are guided by the assessment calendar. Students are assessed weekly in Math & monthly in Reading using the Scantron Achievement Series, Compass Learning Odyssey or Study Island. Based on these assessments, work submissions and/or communication with family & staff the teacher may provide remediation. Directors weekly review participation & proficiency rates & share this data with Lead Teachers & Teachers. Weekly, teachers are provided with a summary of student attendance, assessment participation & proficiency, and interventions. Monthly, the Response to Instruction & Intervention (RtII) Coordinators analyze student data for adjustments in levels of support. We recognize there is inconsistent analysis of data & monitoring of assessments as we also see inconsistent response to the data & differentiation of instruction. To assist teachers struggling with data driven instruction, increased professional development and 1 on 1 coaching is provided.
3	Is there strong, observable evidence that struggling students are identified early and are supported by an intervention system with procedures for monitoring effectiveness?	Yes	Math & Reading Scantron Performance Series Assessments within 2 weeks of enrollment & review of previous PSSA scores assist in identifying a student's appropriate RtII Tier placement. In addition, home visits are conducted within the first month of enrollment providing a clearer picture of each student, their learning environment and possible learning barriers. Aimsweb benchmarking & progress monitoring was also in place for grades 2 – 8. To continue to monitor for students who may be struggling, monthly student data including course progress, Scantron Achievement Series scores, Compass Learning Odyssey participation, Study Island participation, and attendance are reviewed by the RtII Coordinators for recommendations within the three Tiers. Tier III support is provided by a Special Education Teacher, a Math Specialist and/or a Reading Specialist. Paraeducators are assigned to struggling students to assist with participation in classes, assessments and remediation sessions.
4	Is there strong, observable evidence that all students have access to standards aligned curriculum and challenging assignments?	Yes	All of our students have access to the On Line School (OLS) and the K12 curriculum. The curriculum is challenging, rigorous, and is aligned to the state standards. We continue to review our curriculum and align to state and common core standards. All English Language Learners are kept in their grade level courses. The ESL teachers assist the general education teachers in adapting instruction and academic expectations. Students with disabilities receive their IEP allowable modifications and accommodations. We are working toward increasing the Co-Teaching Model from High School to all grades levels. We have a strong Life Skills support program utilizing the OLS and alternative curriculums. Professional Development in August and during the school year include sessions on differentiated instruction. This training is ongoing. In addition, to assist students meet state standards, students are provided support through Study Island, Compass Learning Odyssey, and Scantron.
5	Is there strong, observable evidence that student needs drive decisions about teacher assignments?	Yes	At hire all teachers and paraprofessionals met the criteria for HQT status meaning all students have a Highly Qualified Teacher. We hire teachers who reside in the geographic areas of our students to allow for home visits, face to face remediation and interventions. Through the RtII process students are identified and placed with a Math and/or Reading Specialists who provides supplemental support to students based on their academic need. Paraprofessionals are assigned to support specific student's engagement and/or academic needs.
6	Is there strong, observable evidence that professional development is focused, strategic and implemented with fidelity?	Yes	Professional Development is based on a needs assessment which includes teacher surveys & spring planning department meetings. PDE approved a 3 year Professional Education Report in Feb 2010 with 3 goals: Staff will 1) effectively implement the interventions our school has in place to increase student engagement 2) effectively use technology to increase student engagement & achievement 3) have the tools & training to implement effective instructional strategies to accommodate & differentiate instruction for all students. We will review yearly. New teachers receive 40-50 hours of intensive virtual teacher training by K12, Inc & 10-20 hours of in-house training. We meet face to face 4 times a year & weekly in a virtual setting. Agendas, sign in sheets & post session surveys monitor topics & participation. Classroom observations

			& teacher evaluations monitor for effective & consistent implementation. Academic Directors & Leads develop, plan, & lead the majority of these sessions.
7	Is there strong, observable evidence that teachers and administrators meet regularly to reflect on the progress of students learning using multiple data sources and professional practice?	Yes	Teachers and academic administrators meet weekly and review results of single strand assessments for all students in grades 3-8 and 11. Instructional interventions are developed and implemented based on this weekly, individualized data. Monthly Data (Data Days) is reviewed by the RtII Coordinators with Lead Teachers. During this time they review appropriateness of our students' tier placement and adjustments are made according to newly collected data.
8	Is there strong, observable evidence that teachers and administrators receive timely, effective support and intervention as needed?	Yes	Mentors are assigned to new teachers and orientation is provided. Mentors meet weekly with mentees. Improvement plans are in place for struggling teachers. The plan is reviewed in 30 days. Student data from Scantron Achievement series, Study Island, and Compass Learning Odyssey can be utilized to identify potentially struggling teachers.
9	Is there strong, observable evidence that each school's resources effectively address each school's instructional priorities?	Yes	Agora teachers begin work at least two weeks before classes start. The focus and primary emphasis for this period of time is targeted professional development. This year we focused on building relationships such as those that can be accomplished through home visits. New teachers receive an additional 40 hours of training on systems, tools and best practices from more experienced peers. The school allocates \$1500 per teacher on continuing education reimbursement and up to \$500 per teacher on content-specific conferences or related training from external sources. In total, 10% of teacher days worked and 15% of personnel costs are earmarked for professional development and training.
10	Is there strong, observable evidence that each school's administrative team leads the implementation of a standards-aligned system?	Yes	Academic Directors oversee the academic program using the Student Achievement Improvement Plan, School Improvement Plan and Professional Development Plan as guidelines. In addition, they access resources, workshops and professional development from PaTTan, K12 and PDE such as the SAS training provided by PDE. Student achievement on standards based assessments are reviewed by the Lead Teachers with their team of teachers. Leads provide sample lessons on the standards and provide model recordings. Weekly, Leads send messaging of the standards. Quarterly and as needed the Leads provide informal coaching and one-on-one coaching with each teacher. Academic Directors and Lead Teachers conduct teacher evaluations twice a year. During the evaluation process professional development goals and how they relate to the criteria for effective teaching are reviewed. Failure to meet improvement goals may lead to an Improvement Plan which will be reviewed in 30 days.
11	Is there strong, observable evidence that each member of the school community promotes, enhances and sustains a shared vision of positive school climate?	Yes	At the start of school year, our school's mission, goals, core values & expectations were reviewed. We celebrate both our students & staff. During the biweekly schoolwide meetings & in the team meetings, Administration highlights high participation rates, passing rates, successful Agora Days Out events as well as share parent comments of successful interventions & supports. We recognize students with high participation rates on assessments as well as personal accomplishments in all communication including Newsletters, on the online community portal The Big Think and Honor Roll Assemblies. To build camaraderie we've built in mandatory fun into professional development. A staff survey is conducted which includes questions such as "why choose this educational model" and opportunities for feedback is incorporated into the evaluation tool conducted twice a year. Families are sent a similar survey to gather feedback. Title I parent meetings are recorded which includes family feedback.
12	Is there strong, observable evidence that school staff monitor attendance and student engagement and respond with classroom and school-wide interventions when students are chronically absent or disengaged?	No	The Attendance Office monitors & records attendance. At each unexcused absence electronic correspondence is sent & a call is made by a Truancy Prevention Outreach Worker. The Truancy Prevention Coordinator reaches out to families, may go with teachers on home visits, & invites parents to Truancy Elimination Plan (TEP) meetings where the legal implications of truancy & our attendance policy is reviewed. Teachers monitor student engagement through the On Line School. Students with high unexcused absences & lack of academic progress are placed on a plan under the Attendance Academic Progress & Achievement Policy and are required to attend live Elluminate sessions. Teachers can request additional support by the School Social Worker or Family Support Staff. Through these efforts we have increased the graduation rate to 78% from 68% (2008-2009). We recognize the need to continue efforts to increase engagement thereby continuing the positive trend toward meeting the graduation rate target.

Prioritize Concerns

In the table below, the school has identified and prioritized the systems concerns from their self-assessment using the Foundational Guiding Questions. For each prioritized concern listed, the school will develop an Action Sequence.

#	Systems Concerns
1	Evidence of consistent implementation of effective instructional practices is not visible across all grade levels and classrooms which is negatively impacting student achievement.
2	There is a lack of evidence that all staff utilize and analyze the results of formative, or summative assessments to adjust instructional practices consistently.
3	Although we continue to see improvement, student engagement and its impact on the graduation rate remain a concern.

Student Achievement Goals

The following table documents student achievement goals in Reading and Math established by the school for all relevant subgroups (N≥40) in all tested grades.

Reading: 2011 NCLB/AYP Target: 72%							
Student Group	Grade 11	Grade 8	Grade 7	Grade 6	Grade 5	Grade 4	Grade 3
Students Overall	61.00	70.00	68.00	61.00	61.00	61.00	67.00
White	67.00	70.00	68.00	67.00	67.00	67.00	67.00
Black	61.00	70.00	68.00	61.00	61.00	61.00	67.00
Latino/Hispanic	61.00	70.00	68.00	61.00	61.00	61.00	67.00
Multi-racial/ethnic	63.00	70.00	68.00	63.00	63.00	63.00	67.00
IEP - Special Education	61.00	70.00	68.00	61.00	61.00	61.00	67.00
Economically Disadvantaged	61.00	70.00	68.00	61.00	61.00	61.00	67.00

Math: 2011 NCLB/AYP Target: 67%							
Student Group	Grade 11	Grade 8	Grade 7	Grade 6	Grade 5	Grade 4	Grade 3
Students Overall	53.00	53.00	58.00	55.00	53.00	68.00	60.00
White	58.00	58.00	58.00	58.00	58.00	68.00	60.00
Black	53.00	53.00	58.00	55.00	53.00	68.00	60.00
Latino/Hispanic	53.00	53.00	58.00	55.00	53.00	68.00	60.00
Multi-racial/ethnic	53.00	53.00	58.00	55.00	53.00	68.00	60.00
IEP - Special Education	53.00	53.00	58.00	55.00	53.00	68.00	60.00
Economically Disadvantaged	53.00	53.00	58.00	55.00	53.00	68.00	60.00

Student Achievement Goals - Other

<p>Reading Participation 2011 NCLB/AYP Target 95%</p>	95% overall and for all subgroups.
<p>Math Participation 2011 NCLB/AYP Target 95%</p>	95% overall and for all subgroups.
<p>ATTENDANCE (K-8 Only) 2011 NCLB/AYP Target 90% (or improvement from previous year's attendance)</p>	Since Agora has a graduating class this does not apply but we have a goal of 90% overall and for all subgroups.
<p>GRADUATION RATE (HS Only) 2011 NCLB/AYP Target 82.5% (or 10% reduction between 85% goal and the previous year's graduation rate)</p>	85% graduation rate overall and for all subgroups.

Plan Solution

The Action Sequence below lays out the specific steps needed to implement research-based strategies and best practices designed to address the school's prioritized concerns.

Action Sequence 1

STEP 1: What is the problem?	STEP 2: What will you do?		STEP 3: Why are you doing it?
Area of concern: Enter a High Priority Concern from the Foundational Guiding Questions	Research Based Strategies/Best Practices: Enter what will be done to address the concern		Reason: How will implementing this strategy address weaknesses in student achievement?
Evidence of consistent implementation of effective instructional practices is not visible across all grade levels and classrooms which is negatively impacting student achievement.	A comprehensive teacher support system will be designed to provide consistent implementation of standards aligned curriculum and effective instructional practices to increase student achievement.		Teachers will have the support of Instructional Coaches and Academic Directors to ensure that standards aligned instruction and best practices are being implemented across all grade levels through classroom observation and weekly student data analysis. This will provide students greater opportunity for achievement. We will give students performance assessments upon enrollment to identify each student's learning gaps which will provide instructors with guidance for supports which may be needed to eliminate learning barriers such as referrals for Math and/or Reading Specialists, Special Education, or face to face remediation.
Check the target area(s) that will be addressed by implementation of the research based strategy/best practice in Step 2:			
Performance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math	Participation: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math		Other (please list):
STEP 4: How will you get there?			
What Needs to Be Done: List the steps needed to implement this research based strategy/best practice	Who is responsible?	When will it be done?	What resources are needed?
Math and Reading baseline assessments will be administered within the first two weeks of the student's enrollment. Spring post testing will be completed by students in the Spring in order to measure student growth scores and classroom average growth per teacher.	Teachers and Instructional Coaches	Within the first two weeks of a student's enrollment	Comprehensive Professional Development on conducting initial academic/performance screening and analyzing results will be planned and conducted. We will provide appropriate assessment tools and on-going data analysis training to the staff. Instructional Coaches will support on-going professional development to help impact consistent implementation of standards based instruction and to provide support of best instructional practices across all grade levels for teachers.
Monthly student progress reports on grade level standards will be evaluated to identify student strengths and challenges. According to this data teachers will identify additional individual needs for remediation. This monitoring will be completed to ensure that all students are progressing according to their ability and individualized goals.	Teachers and Leadership Team	Monthly during the school year	Progress Reporting tools and professional development on how to identify students at risk will be provided. Instructional Coaches will provide teachers with support in evaluating reports, developing student learning plans and implementing research based instructional strategies to meet student needs.
Through RTII, students will be identified for support with a Specialist in math and/or reading. We will utilize the RTII process to identify appropriate supports based on tier placement and follow up with monthly review.	RTII Coordinator, Master teachers of reading and math remediation	Ongoing	Staff for comprehensive analysis and provide professional development of RTII process will be identified. Math and Reading Specialists will be utilized for intensive remediation to close achievement gaps. Title I funds will be used to support the Math and Reading Specialist positions.
Instructional Coaches will be			

<p>identified through an intense interview process and trained prior to the start of school. They will receive ongoing professional development on instructional coaching best practices throughout the school year.</p>	<p>Instructional Coach Mentor</p>	<p>Prior to start of the school year: 9/16/2011</p>	<p>University of Kansas - Institute for Instructional Coaching - Level 1 and Level 2</p>
<p>Directors will evaluate teachers three times a year with the expectation that the Essential Elements of Instruction are utilized in every lesson thereby ensuring effective standards based instruction.</p>	<p>Academic Directors</p>	<p>November 2011, February 2012, and May 2012</p>	<p>Professional Development on Essential Elements of Instruction, Personnel and evaluation tool will be used to track on going teacher performance.</p>
<p>STEP 5: How will you know you are doing what you planned?</p>		<p>Step 6: What will you look for to determine if it is working?</p>	
<p>Indicators of Implementation: What the adults will be doing</p>		<p>Indicators of Effectiveness: Set measurable student achievement targets</p>	
<p>Instructional Coaches will receive training and Professional Development on implementing coaching in an instructional environment and understand best coaching practices prior to the start of the school year. Within two weeks of enrollments students will be evaluated and teachers will be reviewing student data to identify appropriate learning paths for each student. The RTII coordinators along with the Master teachers of math and reading remediation will track students through the RTII process and assign students to math and reading specialists as remediation supports are needed. Teachers will use the essential elements of instruction including standards for lessons. Teachers will utilize the expertise of Instructional Coaches to implement best instructional practices. Teachers and Administrators will follow GPA, attendance and course progress to target and address academic learning gaps. Teachers will be observed by academic administrators and feedback will be provided and goal setting will occur 3 times per year on the essential elements of instruction which emphasize standards based instruction in all grades K-12. Teacher metrics will be analyzed weekly and summarized monthly by the academic leadership team. This data will include passing rates, attendance rates, and formative and summative student assessment data from classroom instruction and/or from programs such as Study Island. Teacher will send students and parents monthly progress updates on standards master</p>		<p>Based on observational data by Academic Administrators and Instructional Coaches, teachers will be using differentiated instruction 100% of the time. The rate of student achievement will increase to meet the state's AYP requirements. Teachers will achieve above average or superior scores on classroom observations based on differentiating instruction and including all of the essential elements in every lesson. Course passing rates will be met at 80% or higher and Attendance will be at 95%.</p>	

Action Sequence 2

STEP 1: What is the problem?	STEP 2: What will you do?		STEP 3: Why are you doing it?
Area of concern: Enter a High Priority Concern from the Foundational Guiding Questions	Research Based Strategies/Best Practices: Enter what will be done to address the concern		Reason: How will implementing this strategy address weaknesses in student achievement?
There is a lack of evidence that all staff utilize and analyze the results of formative, or summative assessments to adjust instructional practices consistently.	A comprehensive teacher support system (including professional development in Co-Teaching and Differentiated instruction and implementation of Instructional Coaches) will be designed to assure standards aligned assessments are analyzed consistently and instructional practices are adjusted to provide effective instruction and intervention for each student.		By disaggregating the data and using the data to guide instruction, students will be remediated based on their need. Individualized instruction will be targeted to specific needs and, in turn, student achievement will increase.
Check the target area(s) that will be addressed by implementation of the research based strategy/best practice in Step 2:			
Performance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math	Participation: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math		Other (please list):
STEP 4: How will you get there?			
What Needs to Be Done: List the steps needed to implement this research based strategy/best practice	Who is responsible?	When will it be done?	What resources are needed?
Professional Development in differentiated instruction.	Professional Development Coordinator/ Instructional Coaches	August, October, March as well as focuses in weekly Professional Development meetings.	Researched based professional development opportunities will be scheduled. We will identify and invite recognized authorities in this field to present to staff. We will identify and purchase books and reference materials for instructors. Conference locations will be identified and secured.
Professional Development in Co teaching	Instructional Coaches, Professional Development Coordinator	August, October, March as well as focuses in weekly Professional development meetings.	We will partner with experts in this field, including the Chester County Intermediate Unit. Professional Development will be scheduled and location sites confirmed during the school year. Instructional Coaches will model and support teachers in implementing effective Co Teaching practices within the classroom based on analysis of student data.
Professional Development in reading and analyzing data	Master teachers	August and weekly in Professional Development meetings	We will provide training on reading and Excel and how to effectively use to analyze data. Professional Development will review the metrics to be collected during the schol year and how to adjust instruction based on this student data.
Frequent and on going classroom observations will be conducted to ensure effective instructional strategies are being implemented.	Instructional Coaches, Academic Administrators	September, December, February and May	Rubric for using Essential Elements of Instruction which will be reviewed with staff for a clear understanding of expectations and responsibilities. Instructional Coaches and Academic Administrators will conduct evaluations and provide feedback.
Monthly pre and post tests will be analyzed by instructors to identify each students strengths and needs and adjust instruction as appropriate.	Teachers	Beginning and end of month	Assessment tool will be available that assesses certain standards and provides a learning path for each student. Trainings of the tool and how to pull reports and monitor progress will be scheduled.
Individual learning paths for each student will be created and implemented based on the results of formative assessments.	Family Coaches and Teacher	These plans will be created within 30 days of enrollment and will be updated throughout the year.	Professional Development for the Family Coaches will be provided on identifying individual learning plans for each student. Template for capturing data and recording goals will be reviewed with staff.
Creation of new position, Instructional Coaches, to support teachers and model			Training will be provided for the Instructional Coaches. Resource materials will be identified for purchase and provided to develop and

<p>how to effectively analyze student data in order to appropriately differentiate instruction.</p>	<p>Academic Administrators</p>	<p>During School Year</p>	<p>implement the instructional coaching model. A metrics will be finalized and reviewed with staff which will monitor that consistent, effective analysis of data is occurring during the school year.</p>
<p>STEP 5: How will you know you are doing what you planned?</p>		<p>Step 6: What will you look for to determine if it is working?</p>	
<p>Indicators of Implementation: What the adults will be doing</p>		<p>Indicators of Effectiveness: Set measurable student achievement targets</p>	
<p>All teachers will be coteaching and analyzing data to guide instruction. Instructional coaches will be observing and monitoring teachers on a weekly basis to ensure that best instructional practices are being followed. Data will be analyzed on a weekly basis and, based on the data, instructional changes will be made. Monthly formative assessments will be given, remediation based on student need will be provided. A post test each month will show whether or not mastery was achieved.</p>		<p>Based on observational data, teachers will be using differentiated instruction 100% of the time. The rate of student achievement will increase to meet the state's AYP requirements. Teachers will achieve above average or superior scores on classroom observations based on differentiating and essential elements.</p>	

Action Sequence 3

STEP 1: What is the problem?	STEP 2: What will you do?	STEP 3: Why are you doing it?	
Area of concern: Enter a High Priority Concern from the Foundational Guiding Questions	Research Based Strategies/Best Practices: Enter what will be done to address the concern	Reason: How will implementing this strategy address weaknesses in student achievement?	
Although we continue to see improvement, student engagement and its impact on the graduation rate remain a concern.	Design specific classroom and schoolwide practices to increase student engagement thereby increasing the graduation rate and student achievement.	Implementing these strategies will address weakness in student achievement because face to face enrollment will provide strong introduction to the cyber education world; home visits will present the opportunity to identify student needs; the Truancy Elimination Plan (TEP) will target additional needs and engage families through a plan; the policy implementation will help students to devise a plan for success to bring up grades; the counselor tracking system will identify what is needed for students to graduate whereby all will be able to address weaknesses in student achievement and identify strengths.	
Check the target area(s) that will be addressed by implementation of the research based strategy/best practice in Step 2:			
Performance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math	Participation: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math	Other (please list): Graduation Rate	
STEP 4: How will you get there?			
What Needs to Be Done: List the steps needed to implement this research based strategy/best practice	Who is responsible?	When will it be done?	What resources are needed?
Provide families with clear understanding of our model through Face to Face Enrollment and Home/Face to Face Visits to build relationships.	Teachers, Family Coaches, Enrollment team	Throughout the year	Personnel to conduct the Agora overview presentations will be assigned. The Acknowledgment of School Expectations form to document parent participation and understanding of our model will be shared. Professional Development on building relationships through Home/Face to Face visits will be conducted.
Truancy Prevention and Elimination Program Coordinator and Family Coaches will continue to monitor attendance and work with families to address attendance issues. By identifying and eliminating attendance barriers early we decrease truancy, dropouts and increase student achievement.	Truancy Coordinator, attendance office, teachers, family coaches	Throughout the year	Attendance Department will continue to maintain attendance records. Personnel to conduct TEP meetings, distribute and monitor TEP agreement plan, and prepare Individual Academic plans for all students.
Develop the role of the Family Coach	Academic administrators	At the beginning of August and throughout the year	Comprehensive training plan for family coaches with some topics including: Mentoring, cultural diversity, learning plan development, program awareness (K-12), cohort rates for high school to name a few.
We will continue to implement the Academic Achievement and Attendance Policy plan with low attendance and course average below 30% by devising and implementing a plan to help the student get back on track.	Family Coaches and Teachers	At the beginning of the school year and throughout the year	List of students meeting attendance and progress definition will be maintained; step by step individual plan to move students toward success will be developed and monitored
Guidance counselors will track high school student progress toward graduation on a data base that is accessible to administration in order to ensure graduation cohort is met.	Guidance counselors and Administration	At the beginning of the school year and on going throughout the year	Data base tracking tool and transcripts/academic plan for each student will be utilized

<p>Family Involvement Coordinator will continue to build on efforts to increase outreach to families</p>	<p>Academic Administrators</p>	<p>At the beginning of August and throughout the year</p>	<p>Family Involvement Coordinator will have a communication and training plan for families. Title I Parent Involvement funds will be available to support parent workshops.</p>
<p>STEP 5: How will you know you are doing what you planned?</p>		<p>Step 6: What will you look for to determine if it is working?</p>	
<p>Indicators of Implementation: What the adults will be doing</p>		<p>Indicators of Effectiveness: Set measurable student achievement targets</p>	
<p>Based on observational and recorded data, Family Coaches will be meeting with families and identifying needs and referring to teachers, school or community supports. TEP plans will be developed and signed by families. Academic Achievement and attendance plans will be developed and implemented. A database of 12th graders will be maintained and updated daily through graduation. Individual academic plans will be developed for all K-12th grade students with graduation as a goal. The Family Involvement Coordinator will continue to work with parents to identify resources and practices to engage families.</p>		<p>Effectiveness will be measured by a decrease in the dropout rate by 5% by increasing home visits for all families to 100% as well as sustained enrollment target of 80% in k-8 and 75% in high school. The ultimate goal is to meet all state targets including the graduation rate.</p>	




















Action Sequence 4

STEP 1: What is the problem?	STEP 2: What will you do?		STEP 3: Why are you doing it?	
Area of concern: Enter a High Priority Concern from the Foundational Guiding Questions	Research Based Strategies/Best Practices: Enter what will be done to address the concern		Reason: How will implementing this strategy address weaknesses in student achievement?	
Check the target area(s) that will be addressed by implementation of the research based strategy/best practice in Step 2:				
Performance: <input type="checkbox"/> Reading <input type="checkbox"/> Math	Participation: <input type="checkbox"/> Reading <input type="checkbox"/> Math		Other (please list):	
STEP 4: How will you get there?				
What Needs to Be Done: List the steps needed to implement this research based strategy/best practice	Who is responsible?	When will it be done?	What resources are needed?	
No data has been submitted.				
STEP 5: How will you know you are doing what you planned?			Step 6: What will you look for to determine if it is working?	
Indicators of Implementation: What the adults will be doing			Indicators of Effectiveness: Set measurable student achievement targets	

Professional Development

Listed below is the professional development needed to implement the action sequence.

Date/Time	Topic/Audience/Purpose	Alignment to Action Sequence				Facilitator/Provider	Anticipated changes in teacher practice that will be observed
		Action 1	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4		
August 2011	Common Core/Instructional and Supporting Staff/Continued professional development of Common Core, PA Standards and our curriculum	✔ Action 1	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Teachers will begin to use resources available to bridge gaps between PA Standards and Common Core
August 2011	Mission and values of Agora including structure and teaching as Leadership/Instructional and Supporting Staff/Clear Communication of mission and values	✔ Action 1	Action 2	✔ Action 3	Action 4	Head of School	Teachers will use knowledge of mission and vision to impact their interactions with students.
October 2011	Handling Non-Compliant Students & Families/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review supports available to the teacher, recommended follow up and the impact to student achievement, attendance, and the graduation rate.	✔ Action 1	✔ Action 2	✔ Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Teachers will have a clear understanding of responsibilities and will effectively utilize school resources to reengage students.
August 2011	Home Visits/Instructional and Supporting Staff/Review goals of visits and how to effectively conduct visits	Action 1	Action 2	✔ Action 3	Action 4	Truancy Prevention Coordinator and Social Worker	Understanding of our goal to increase engagement, achievement, and attendance, while decreasing withdrawals and dropouts.
August 2011	Identifying at-risk learners (RTII)/Instructional and Supporting Staff/Review process to identify and support student academic needs	✔ Action 1	✔ Action 2	✔ Action 3	Action 4	Federal Programs Coordinator	Utilize the process to identify and support student academic needs.
August 2011	Metrics/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Understand collection of and how to effectively analyze metrics	✔ Action 1	✔ Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Teachers will analyze data to identify achievement gaps and inform instruction
August 2011	Illuminate Integration/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Introduction of Illuminate Integration and how to use effectively	✔ Action 1	✔ Action 2	✔ Action 3	Action 4	Staff Developer/Master Teacher	Implement Illuminate Integration Tool
August 2011	Staff Evaluations and Teacher Observations/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review observation and evaluation expectations	✔ Action 1	✔ Action 2	✔ Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Teachers will have a clear understanding of observation and evaluation expectations evidenced by high scores
							Teachers will have a clear

September 2011	Teaching as Leadership/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review what this means and how to implement	 Action 1	 Action 2	 Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	understanding of their role as leaders and will use that knowledge to impact student achievement, attendance, and the graduation rate.
September 2011	OLS & LMS, Scantron, Study Island and Compass Learning/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review the tools available to identify achievement gaps	 Action 1	 Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Teachers will effectively use these tools to identify if a child may have achievement gaps and appropriately modify instruction
September 2011	Homeless Students/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review process for identification and how to support the student's academic needs.	 Action 1	 Action 2	 Action 3	Action 4	Homeless Liaison	Teachers will understand how students are identified as homeless and will implement supports to address the student's academic needs.
September 2011	Recognizing Learning Barriers/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review the barriers our students face, how to identify and address	 Action 1	 Action 2	 Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Teachers will understand how to identify learning barriers early and how to support the student's academic needs.
October 2011	Title I Remediation/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review process for identification and how to support the student's academic needs.	 Action 1	 Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Federal Programs Coordinator	Teachers will understand how students are identified, their role within the identification process and will implement strategies to support the student's academic needs.
October 2011	SAP Training/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review referral process and how to support how to support the student's needs.	 Action 1	 Action 2	 Action 3	Action 4	SAP Coordinator	Utilize the process to identify and support student academic needs.
October 2011	Special Education/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review process for identification, legal requirements and how to support the student's academic needs.	 Action 1	 Action 2	 Action 3	Action 4	Special Education Manager	Teachers will understand how students are identified, their role within the identification process, their responsibilities within state and federal guidelines, and will implement strategies to support each student's academic needs.
	Growing through Coaching and Reflective						Teachers will utilize this

November 2011	Teaching/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review what this means for the teacher and student	Action 1	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	knowledge to affect student engagement and achievement.
December 2011	Removing Learning Barriers/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/What to do once barriers are identified	Action 1	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Teachers will utilize resources to eliminate learning barriers for each student as identified.
February 2012	Building Community/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/How to build relationships w/students, families and each other.	Action 1	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Staff will use this knowledge to increase support of each other, their students and our goal to increase engagement, achievement, and attendance, while decreasing withdrawals and dropouts.
February 2012	Understanding State Testing/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review of testing protocols, timelines and everyone's roles and responsibilities	Action 1	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Staff will use knowledge to impact their interactions with students and families to increase engagement and achievement.
March 2012	PSSA Training and Plan Rolled Out/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review roles during the testing window	Action 1	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	With a clear understanding of their role and responsibilities during the PSSA testing window, teachers and staff will assist families and students and address any barriers to participation.
April 2012	Making Decisions for Next School Year/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Planning for the next school year	Action 1	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Plans for the next year will be based on analysis of student achievement, engagement, and graduation goals and adjustments made accordingly. All staff will have a clear understanding of their impact during the year and expectations for the new year.
August, October 2011 & Jan, March 2012	Using information, tools, and resources presented and prepared by SAS/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Over the course of 10 months, the Agora teachers, guidance counselors, and advisors will	Action 1	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	SASIT Trainers	Apply the SAS mission and SASIT training objectives to enhance staff collaboration, improve efficiency, and increase consistency and awareness of

	be formally and informally trained on SAS and the use of the SAS Portal.						standards alignment and learning progressions to increase student engagement and achievement.
August, 2011 through June, 2012	Instructional Coaching for all teachers/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/The goal of instructional coaching is to enable teachers to use data to implement scientifically proven instructional practices that will have a positive impact on student achievement.	✓ Action 1	✓ Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Staff Developer/Master Teacher/Instructional Coaches	Teachers partner with Instructional Coaches regularly and consistently to improve and implement effective instructional practices
May and June 2012	Reflecting, Celebrating Successes, Reviewing Lessons Learned/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/A look back at the school year and how to build on successes	✓ Action 1	✓ Action 2	✓ Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Staff will use the knowledge gained during the school year to impact their interactions with students and families to increase engagement and achievement. Successful practices will be shared in order for others to learn and implement as needed.
Monthly from August to June	Instructional Model including Essential Elements of Instruction and Co-Teaching/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Continued professional development on Essential Elements of Instruction	✓ Action 1	✓ Action 2	✓ Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team and CCIU Instructor	Teachers will identify and utilize all elements of instruction in their lessons
October 2011 and January 2012	RTII/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review process to identify and support student academic needs	✓ Action 1	✓ Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Federal Programs Coordinator	Utilize the process to identify and support student academic needs.
Sept and Nov 2011 and January 2012	Diagnosing Student Needs (Progress Reports and Individual Learning Plans ILPs)/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review how to effectively create and monitor Progress Reports and ILPs	✓ Action 1	✓ Action 2	✓ Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Utilize the documents to identify, effectively monitor and support student academic needs.
Sept, Oct, Nov 2011 and Feb, March 2012	Technology/Instructional Staff and Supporting Staff/Review tools available such as ipen and Excel	Action 1	✓ Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Senior Academic Team	Teachers will use the tools available to improve and implement effective instructional practices

Parental Involvement

Schools in improvement must address parental involvement in their plan in the following three areas:
(optional for Warning schools)

FAMILY/PRACTICE NOTIFICATION: Describe the processes used for notifying parents of the school's AYP status.	COMMUNICATION: Describe how school improvement efforts will be communicated to parents and the community.	FAMILY SUPPORT & PARTNERSHIPS: Describe strategies to engage parents in supporting teachers to educate their children.
<p>-On August 16, 2010 a kmail (internal school e-mail) which included our School Improvement status was sent to families and posted on the website. -At the Title I Parent Meetings our AYP status and School Improvement Plan were discussed and parents were referred to the district website. -Our newsletter provides families with the URL of our website for information about School Improvement.</p>	<p>-School Board Meetings and the minutes are posted on our website - Our website is updated in a timely fashion -As students are identified as needing supports, families will be contacted about the support</p>	<p>-Parent Involvement Committee (PIC) and Boosters Club are in place and allow parents the opportunity to provide feedback and support our teachers. -The Family Involvement Coordinator provides opportunities for parents to attend workshops and promotes parent involvement in programming and professional development -We are participating in the Parent Leadership Academy (PLA) and we have a designated Liaison. -Face to Face Events are offered across the state and are opportunities for parents and teachers to meet. - Daily communication and 24/7 access through internal school e-mail (kmail) means a parent can reach out to staff at any time with questions, concerns and other feedback. -Parent Orientations during enrollment provide parents with information about our model and an understanding of how they can support their child and teacher. If the parent is also the Learning Coach they understand the partnership and importance of open communication needed between them and teachers.</p>